A 'Prosthetic Economy'

Representing the 'Kriegskrüppel' in the Weimar Republic

> 'War to me was never anything but horror, mutilation and senseless destruction…I drew soldiers without noses; war cripples with crab-like limbs of steel; two medical orderlies tying a violent infantryman up in a horse blanket; a one-armed soldier using his good hand to salute a heavily bemedalled lady who had just passed him a biscuit…a hospital orderly emptying a bucket full of pieces of human flesh down a pit…'[1] (George Grosz *A Small Yes and a Big No*, 1946)

The opening pages of the seventh chapter of George Grosz's autobiography, *A Small Yes and a Big No*, published three decades after the outbreak of the First World War, still resonate with the visceral brutality of trench warfare. Very few radical artists on either side of the conflict who managed to survive, remember it in terms other than horror, bitterness, pain, and in Germany especially, betrayal by the authorities - whether they served directly at the front or not.[2] As Deborah Cohen has commented, 'the First World War was murderous without precedent. More than nine and a half million soldiers died over a period of 52 months; twenty million men were severely wounded, and eight million veterans returned home permanently disabled.'[3] Grosz's vivid descriptions of the mutilations of war on the soldier's body haunted his work both during and after 1918, spawning the biting political critique that still characterises his artistic legacy, particularly with its origins in Berlin Dada. For Grosz, Otto Dix, Heinrich Hoerle and other erstwhile German Dadaists of their generation, the neglected, disabled male war veteran - selling matches, playing cards, operating machinery on the factory assembly-line or begging on the streets - became a stock-in-trade of their early Weimar oeuvre, whose female counterpart was the (often syphilitic) urban prostitute. The 'cripple' and the 'whore' were the symbolic visual tropes in the masculine avant garde's arsenal against the socio-political inequities of the fragile German Republic. Carol Poore has observed how able-bodied artists 'took up the subject of disability more often during the

Weimar era than at any other time in German cultural history.'[4] The body of the 'other' (racialized, sexualised, disabled) was used as a visual symptom for the diseased 'body politic.' The artworks produced reveal more about the construction of 'normalcy' and the 'ideal' during this period, than they do about the disabled veterans they depict. As Lennard J. Davis reminds us, 'to understand the disabled body, one must return to the concept of the norm, the normal body.'[5] Indeed the 'problem' as he observes, 'is not the person with disabilities; the problem is the way that normalcy is constructed to create the 'problem' of the disabled person.' This is a particularly compelling way in which art historians might also want to re-conceptualise the avant-garde's engagement with the broken bodies of disabled soldiers during this era. When discourses of disability are considered within the art histories of the Weimar Republic, it is often Otto Dix's 1920 series of four mixed media works on the theme of the *Kriegskrüppel* (war disabled) that are a dominant focus. *Pragerstraße (Dedicated to my Contemporaries), Match Seller I, Skat Players* and *45% fit for work* (*War Cripples*), also referred to as the 'prosthesis-wearers' series,' have been hailed as objects of 'truth' by influential commentators on *Neue Sachlichkeit* such as Wieland Schmied.[6] Of the four works in the series, *Skat Players* [Fig.1] and the missing, likely destroyed, *45% fit for work* (*War Cripples*) [Fig. 2] are repeatedly singled out for close analysis; they rank amongst the most brutal of Dada's excoriating visual polemics against the war and all those who promoted it.[7] The fact that *Skat Players* was alleged to have been based on Dix's eye-witness encounter of a group of maimed veterans playing cards in the back room of a Dresden café, hidden from the general public, is likely cause for some of the 'truth' statements that often accompany its analysis.[8] Yet these works are self-evidently extreme products of Dix's post-war Dada imagination. As Mia Finemann has commented, Dix 'dramatically rendered the disabled veteran as a monstrous and anachronistic survival of Prussian militarism in the Weimar Republic.' And, she continues, 'he renders a cynical ontology of partiality that responded to the brutal mutilation, fragmentation, and cursory re-assemblage of a formerly unified human body blasted apart by the war.'[9] Dix's *45% Fit for Work*, unambiguously

refers to the Military Pensions Law (Reichsversogungsgesetz, RVG), passed by the new Republic on 12 May 1920, which clarified the extent of social welfare available to war victims but with a strong emphasis on rehabilitation for return to work or 'service'.[10] The amount of pension a veteran would receive was dependent on how he was assessed by military authorities, in terms of his fitness for work which, according to Paul Lerner 'made the German system unique.'[11] Pensions assessment would be an arduous process by medics who would often know very little about the jobs of the men they examined. It is likely that many veterans suffering from war neuroses must have been extremely reluctant to submit themselves to further medico-military scrutiny once demobilized. As a law clearly designed to reduce the burden of costs to the state in support of its war disabled, it left many of them little choice but to return to work or beg on the streets if they were to survive. Indeed, Heather Perry has commented that as far back as 1915, 'officials in Saxony had been interested in how to maximise the labour of Germany's disabled soldiers.'[12] Thus, under the parallel Law for the Employment of the Severely Disabled (*Schwerbeschädigtengesetz*), also of 1920, approximately 90% of severely disabled veterans in Germany held down jobs during Weimar era, since it was virtually impossible to fire them.[13] As Christopher Jackson explains, 'the law required every workplace with 25 or more employees to hire at least one disabled person and established a quota that at least 2% of the jobs in larger workplaces be reserved for the disabled.' As Jackson comments, this 'was a milestone in modern labor law' because of the 'unprecedented establishment of quotas for the hiring of a particular protected group.'[14] Yet, as Dix sardonically noted in the subtitle of *45% Fit for Work*, 'four of these don't add up to a whole man;' evidently Dix's procession of maimed 'military cyborgs' and shell-shocked 'shiverers' could hardly be returned to work at all.[15] Indeed, as Cohen has commented 'the so-called lightly disabled, men with disabilities rated 40% or less' (in a system in which a missing foot was rated at 30%), 'received little compensation.'[16] The state's seeming largesse towards some of its veterans also unexpectedly resulted in a stand-off between the German war disabled and their fellow citizens. Paradoxically, public antipathy towards veterans - who

were more likely to retain employment during the Great Depression than any other sector of the workforce - together with the state's lack of willingness to let the war-disabled co-determine their own welfare, resulted in the veterans' ultimate hostility towards the Republic which had pushed too eagerly to rehabilitate them for work.[17] The Law for the Employment of the Severely Disabled represented an unparalleled step in the extension of state power into the private sphere. Thus, both hard-pressed employers and recovering soldiers in peacetime were once again required to sacrifice their own needs to those of the Fatherland. Dix's early Dada works are arguably the most memorable satires of the troubled figure of the disabled veteran who haunts the visual landscapes of German modernism. They offer an unflinching rendition of the veteran as freak. But what were the alternative roles that the disabled soldier might inhabit? Weimar discourses around the disabled veteran in the aftermath of war were complicated and often violently contradictory. The permanently disabled soldier's body, visible in the workplace and on the streets, was a potent reminder of Germany's bitter defeat; he was used repeatedly by able-bodied members of the radical avant-garde as a thorn in the side of a shaky Republican regime that had been built on hasty and bloody political compromise.[18] Yet he was also the site of a new fascination with technology and with the much-vaunted opportunities for the prosthetically-enhanced body within the capitalist culture of industrial modernity.[19] For Heinrich Hoerle (1895-1936), an early member of Cologne Dada, the depiction of the disabled veteran changed over the course of the Weimar era, as the Republic's attitudes towards visible disability also changed. The disabled, technologically-supplemented body as political sign within Hoerle's oeuvre offers a compelling example of the ways in which art history might intersect with disability studies and medical humanities. This is an area that the discipline has been slow to respond to but which, for the scholar of Weimar Germany, is almost impossible to ignore. The overwhelming number of visual representations - avant-garde and other - in which the disabled body is the central focus often remains a secondary consideration in many studies of Weimar art history, my own to date included.[20] Since Rosemarie Garland Thomson's ground-breaking 1999 study, *Extraordinary*

Bodies, disability studies scholars have clearly shown that the category of 'the disabled' should be understood as culturally constructed rather than medically determined.[21] During the early nineteenth century, under the now discarded term 'handicapped,' (a label discredited by disability rights activists in the 1970s and 80s), the disabled body came to encapsulate unruly bodies under the authority of medical science as sites in need of 'correction.' After the Treaty of Versailles, the enormity of Germany's reparations bill and the country's concomitant rampant inflation, 'managing' the disabled body was also distinctly bound up with the political imperatives of a country in economic crisis. The iconographic shifts in the representation of the disabled veteran within Hoerle's oeuvre offer insight into a particular cultural-historical moment. In 1920s Germany, the disabled body became a cipher for a 'prosthetic economy' (*Prothesenwirtschaft*) in which the driving concern was to ensure that everyone, irrespective of personal considerations, was 'fit for work.'[22] Heinrich Hoerle's oeuvre grapples with the tension between leftist ideals and normative masculine bourgeois individualism played out through his pre-occupation with the fractured body of the proletarian foot-soldier and the prosthetic economy designed to 'repair' him for labour.

Art in Cologne after 1918

Before conscription in 1915, Hoerle had sporadically attended Cologne's School of Applied Arts, (*Kunstgewerbeschule*), where he had met fellow artists Anton Räderscheidt, Marta Hegemann and artist-siblings, Willy and Angelika Fick.[23] During their early student days Räderscheidt, Hegemann, Hoerle and the Ficks immersed themselves in the burgeoning contemporary art scene. The 1912 Cologne Sonderbund exhibition as well as exhibitions of new art hosted by Olga Oppenheimer and Emmy Worringer at their privately owned Gereons Club, left a particularly lasting impression on the young art students.[24] It was during a solo exhibition of Paul Klee at the Gereons Club where Hoerle first met Max Ernst.[25] Together with Ernst, Peter Abelen, Otto Freundlich and others, Hoerle became a member of the 'Lunisten', a group who used to meet at the Café Czaplewski on Cologne's Hohenzollernring, as well as a member of the "Ovarismus" group (based on the somewhat

gendered notion that an egg was the quintessential artistic form), who met at the Café Prinzess.[26] These pre-war friendship networks were to prove decisive for Hoerle's subsequent artistic development, as well as indicative of his early tendency not to align himself solely with one artistic faction but rather to be involved with a number of different groups at any one time. This multiplicity of allegiances can be read in parallel with the diversity of styles, media and materials with which he also experimented throughout his career: from proto-surrealist fantasies to hyper-realist new objectivity, from woodcut and lithography to oils, watercolours, and an unusual, autodidactic wax method. Yet thematically it was the 'war cripple' (*Kriegskrüppel*) who remained a constant leitmotif in his work, although the manner in which he addressed this favoured subject differed markedly across his oeuvre.[27]

At the end of 1918, having received a second-class iron cross after serving for three years in the field artillery on the Western front, Hoerle returned to his native city, Cologne. He was only 19 when he had left for war. Like so many young artists of his generation he had delayed mobilization for as long as possible, on the grounds of pacifism. He returned from service as a field artillery telephone operator, a non-combat position, more determined than ever to continue as an artist but one for whom art's sole purpose could now only be in the service of political revolution against war. In Autumn 1919, Hoerle and Angelika Fick decided to marry and for a short period the couple became a lynch pin in the artistic circles around Cologne Dada and its breakaway group, Gruppe Stupid.[28]

Whilst art histories of Dada in Cologne have been well documented, the activities of Gruppe Stupid, are less familiar.[29] It is likely that Stupid became active during the summer of 1919, a few months before Max Ernst and Alfred Gruenweld (Theodor Baargeld), held their first iteration of Cologne Dada in November, under the title *Section D* at the Kölnische Kunstverein (Cologne Art Association). The term 'Stupidien' had already appeared in Ernst's six issue satirical journal *The Ventilator* in Spring 1919 as a reference to its editors and contributors (which included Ernst, Baargeld, both of the Hoerles and Otto Freundlich) as well as a response to Ernst's designation of himself, Arp and Baargeld as the *Weststupidien 3*

(*W3)*.[30] Core membership of Gruppe Stupid included Marta Hegemann, Anton Räderscheidt, Heinrich and Angelika Hoerle, Willy Fick and Franz Seiwert. Ernst and Baargeld had initially succeeded in attracting Hans Arp, Otto Freundlich, the Hoerles, Räderscheidt, Seiwert and Paul Klee to their Dada cause at the Kölnische Kunstverein. However, shortly before the exhibition opened, Seiwert registered his disapproval at what he perceived as Dada's lack of serious political intentions, professing Dada's visual approach to be at 'odds with his own' which, as Lynette Roth has commented, was 'still rooted in Expressionism.'[31] Seiwert then produced the only statement concerning the aims of Gruppe Stupid in a draft, undated letter to Pol Michels, a fellow 'worker from *Der Aktion* in Berlin' in which he announced a new group, 'under the name 'New Cologne Painting School, Hildenboldplatz 9' whose members included Anton Räderscheidt and Martha Hegemann (whose apartment it was), Heinrich and Angelika Hoerle, Willy Fick and Seiwert. He also attempted to outline the political ideals of the group, their desire to be 'the mouthpiece of the masses' and to paint 'the truth outside' - a 'truth' that included 'machines for profit, worker-slaves, the exploiters and the exploited.' As Seiwert goes on to explain:

> 'Our pictures stand in the service of the exploited to whom we belong and with whom we feel solidarity, therefore we reject the dadaist harlequinade, which is supposedly anti-bourgeois yet created for the delight of the middle-classes, because we don't have to reveal the bankruptcy of the bourgeoisie but rather the creative will of the masses. [32]

Despite Seiwert's attack on 'dadaistic Harlequinade', and his declaration of allegiance with the exploited masses, Gruppe Stupid's flirtation with a proletarian ideal was inevitably brief since none of the group were actually 'exploited' and stylistic differences amongst members soon became apparent, leading to its inevitable though amicable dissolution after only a few months. Yet, during their brief time as a collective, they produced a number of significant print portfolios, the profits of which were ploughed back into the group in order to fund their artistic activities. Indeed, the distribution and sale of print portfolios allowed many artists of

the era to fund their on-going artistic ambitions, particularly in a climate of hyper-inflation and poverty that characterised the economic conditions of occupied Germany after the Treaty of Versailles.

Heinrich Hoerle's *Krüppelmappe* 1920

It was within the context of his membership of Gruppe Stupid that Hoerle set to work on his first full scale response to the aftermath of war, *Die Krüppelmappe* (*The Cripples Portfolio*), a print portfolio which was published in 1920 and that was to establish some of the major themes of his work for a decade to come: economic hardship and unemployment; urban alienation; family ties; prosthetic bodies; contested masculinity and male-female relationships. Although having avoided battle on the frontline, Hoerle's experiences of war, both physically and politically, were nevertheless mediated through his graphic visual responses to it.

The concept of the print portfolio amongst the German avant-garde had received considerable impetus in the pre-war era through the activities of the German Expressionist artists and in particular *Die Brücke*. Limited edition print portfolios enabled artists to work both individually and collaboratively on specific ideas and themes, develop audiences for their works and maintain profitability and the desire for ownership (or indeed 'membership' in the case of *Die Brücke*).[33] George Grosz had published his *Erste* and his *Kleine Grosz Mappen* to critical acclaim in 1917, after his release from military service and a gruelling spell in a psychiatric hospital. His regularly published satirical prints - in rage against the aftermath of war in the new Republic - in Berlin newspapers and illustrated books, were known to Hoerle, Stupid and the Cologne Dadaists through their artistic and literary contacts in Berlin.[34] Individual experiences combined with visual cues culled from both print histories and Berlin Dada are deployed in Hoerle's print cycle for radical political effect. The *Krüppelmappe* was first advertised on the back pages of *Der Strom* in January 1919. It was published by Hoerle's 'Selbst Verlag' ('Self Press', later renamed Schloemilch Verlag), based in the Hoerle's apartment on Bachemer Straße, (known locally as the *Dadaheim*).[35]

Two separate editions were printed, both limited to 250 runs per edition; each portfolio contained twelve lithographs individually hand signed and numbered. The more expensive edition was printed on Japan paper with an original colour drawing on the title page and retailed for the hefty sum of 780 Marks.[36] The cheaper edition, on less expensive paper, replaced the colour drawing with a black and white woodcut; it was also for sale but at less than half price, at 360 Marks.[37] Both were aimed at private collectors, in spite of their politicised subject matter, as a deliberate strategy to raise funds for Gruppe Stupid.

The portfolio consists of twelve delicately executed lithographs calling for 'Help for the Cripple' (*Helft dem Krüppel)* and drawing attention to the plight of the individual war-wounded soldiers seeking to re-integrate themselves into a society and an economy unable to properly support them after bitter defeat in the First World War. In the twelve plates, maimed and wounded veterans are shown in different roles: seeking comfort from loved ones; begging on the streets; haunted by missing limbs, mired in nightmares of exaggerated sexual fantasies; engulfed in both physical and psychological loss, and received with fear, horror and *schadenfreude* by those around them. As the portfolio unfolds, a clear progression emerges from the first six plates to the last. The first six consist of a politically engaged socialist critique of the daily inequities faced by former soldiers now disabled and reliant on ineffectual prostheses, whilst the second six prints in the cycle chart the descent into the psychological and sexual hell of the subjects depicted. They map a move from outer realities to inner fantasies, a dialectic that frequently characterises much of the work produced by the Cologne avant-garde during the Weimar era. The cover page contains the titles for each print, arranged in the form of a prose poem. [Fig. 3]

The first plate exhorts the viewer to 'Help the Cripple' (*Helft dem Krüppel*) [Fig. 4]. The protagonist is shown in a state of transcendent hopelessness, a fallen angel whose arms have been replaced by folded wings and mired in a sea of black despair. The work is 'a mediation on anguish, in which a maelstrom of repetitive lines eddy and flow around a mournful body and contorted claw-like feet.'[38] The position of the figure, with his head

downcast, wings for arms and shrouded in dark folds of protective drapery, self-consciously mimics Dürer's *Melancolia I* of 1514, a work of symbolic of introspection, isolation and psychic suffering. Each subsequent plate follows the pattern established in the first: a single 'cripple' is lithographically drawn against a largely plain background, occasionally given props, and in the case of plates 2 and 5, 'The Married Couple' [Fig. 5] and 'The Father' [Fig. 6], provided with a wife and a child respectively. The pivot around which the caesura between the viewer's outer empathy at the veteran's social estrangement (attempting to hold his child or hug his wife without his hooked prostheses pinching her), and the veteran's inner nightmares and sexual fantasies, occurs exactly half way in the cycle, plate 6, 'Perpetual Pain' [Fig. 7]. The title evokes both the pain of the condition and the pain of being a constant object of the gaze of others. Nervous onlookers peep out of windows of multi-storey buildings at the varieties of broken life on the street below. The subsequent six prints turn to the inner traumas, desires and fantasies triggered by the external pressures on the disabled male veteran trying to reintegrate into society. As Sabine Kriebel observes, Hoerle's repetition of sinuous lines throughout the plates, 'evokes the repetitive gestures of psychic trauma, in which the compulsion to repeat an action signals an attempt to expunge traumatic memory.'[39] This is also evident in the twice-repeated 'Hallucinations' as the title for two adjacent prints in the cycle. In one [Fig. 8], we see the protagonist stuck in a chair. He has stumps in place of arms and short wooden poles instead of feet. He stares in open-mouthed horror at a cluster of flower pots on the floor from which hands and feet have sprouted, clamouring towards him. In the other, [Fig. 9], a single flowerpot, also sprouting a pair of open hands, is being tilted from an unexpectedly animate table 'walking' towards the veteran. He recoils in fear but he is trapped in an angular room, reminiscent of an Expressionist stage set that aptly signifies the anguish of his fragile mental state. The hallucinatory nightmare scenarios in these prints and others, are accompanied by the veteran's sexual fantasies in 'The Tree of Desire' [Fig. 10] and 'The Man with the Wooden Leg Dreams' [Fig. 11]. In these two plates, the prosthetic leg of the dreaming soldier is anthropomorphised into an enlarged erect

phallus, which ejaculates an Eden-like Paradise in one print, (complete with a naked Eve plucking fruit from the 'tree of desire' at the top), and a much-desired foot in the other.[40] As Kriebel has commented, 'there is an acrid irony operative in these works, generated by the combination of emotive line and grotesque subject matter, that pits sentiment against terror and hallucinatory imagination against bitter lucidity.' What began as a series of empathetic portraits are transformed 'into an astringent post-war commentary.'[41] On completion of the portfolio, Hoerle exhibited it in full at the Applied Arts Museum (*Kunstgewerbemuseum*) in Cologne in January 1920 where it attracted critical acclaim from a variety of newspapers, including the *Kölner Tageblatt*, the *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger* and a review by Franz Seiwert in the *Sozialistische Republik*. The *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger* reminded its readers of the powerful example of Goya's eighty plate etching cycle, *The Disasters of War* (1810-20) as a useful comparison, noting that 'Hoerle's work is nothing less than a narrowing of Goya's theme to a particular example, the painful suffering of the cripples as a result of the war.' Goya would have been fresh in both the journalist's and the artist's mind due a widely praised exhibition of historical prints curated by Luise Straus, a member of Hoerle's pre-war circle. Straus (better known subsequently as Lou Straus-Ernst, Max Ernst's first wife), was the first woman to earn a doctorate in the history of art from the Friedrich-Wilhelms-University in Bonn in 1916, prior to her engagement as a curator at Cologne's Wallraf-Richartz Museum. In 1917 she curated an exhibition at the museum on the theme of *Past Representations of War: Graphics from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century*, or as she described it 'a small exhibition of war graphics.'[42] The accompanying twenty pfenning, twelve-page catalogue took the reader on a tour of the art historical trajectory of the impact war as a theme on graphic representations of the past; images of naval battles and vast panoramas of land-based offensives intermingle with heroic individuals on horseback riding into battle and war-dead soldiers hanging from trees or collapsed on the field. Prints by Dürer, Goya and Jacques Callot were displayed amidst works by lesser known printmakers held in the museum's

collection. The concluding passage of Straus's catalogue essay also re-iterated the impact of war on the bodies of men:

> 'Finally, an exposition of the mechanism of the iron hand of Götz von Berlichingen from a work published in honour of the Congress of Vienna, will be considered as an example of care for the war-damaged in former times.'[43]

By including reference to both von Berlichingen's early prosthetic iron hand and the 1814 Congress of Vienna in which European ambassadors met to negotiate lasting peace amongst European powers after the Napoleonic wars, Straus was signalling her political antipathy to the current bloodshed and its devastating effects on the young men of her own generation. As the *Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger* review of Hoerle's *Krüppelmappe* continued:

> 'Some people may feel repulsed, some find Hoerle's intention unartistic because it is oppressive and not liberating. Yet it bears witness to a deep compassion, in the way it allows the armless man to dream of his arm and the cripple's lost limbs to blossom towards him, as it were, out of bush and tree…'[44]

Art historical comparisons were also favoured in the hyperbole of the *Kölner Tageblatt*'s reporter who likened Hoerle's portfolio to a new 'Dance of Death', a perennial favourite amongst German critics; he compares it with:

> 'a gruesome, grotesque, shattering *danse macabre*. For after all, these people shot to pieces and ripped apart by the war, are nothing more than dead people, who now just live in a dream and in the confused imaginings of fever. Scorn for mankind, which abandoned itself in the gruesome madness of self-destruction, flashes out of these pages...'[45]

Seiwert's review in the *Sozialistische Republik*, mockingly entitled *Krupp-Krüppel* (*Krupp's Cripples*) used the occasion of the *Krüppelmappe*'s exhibition as a catalyst for highlighting the suffering of the war-wounded who were daily visible on the streets and for whom society was urged to remember and take responsibility. The Krupp manufacturing firm, based in Essen, the same region of Germany and about eighty kilometres north of Cologne, was the

nation's leading armaments producer during the First World War. Krupp made most of Germany's steel, artillery, ammunition, heavy guns and other armaments - weapons that were directly responsible for the destruction and maiming of soldiers on all sides.[46] Seiwert was less concerned with the art historical contexts of the portfolio as a work of art *per se*, than as a springboard for a socialist polemic against the inequities of life and the suffering of the poor, subject matter that he exhorted fellow artists to engage with:

> 'Here is a poor man with a pencil. He saw the monuments and drew them so that you should see them…Let these monuments be a constant wake-up call to you, bringing you to life...' [47]

The 'crippled' war veterans of Hoerle's portfolio are ultimately left abandoned by society and haunted by their own psychological traumas and sexual fantasies. The delicate execution of the works belies the trauma of their content producing an affective visual testimony to the horrors of war. As already indicated, Hoerle had served at the Front in a non-combat position from 1915 until the end of the war in 1918 but as with all survivors from this otherwise unimaginably barbarous period, the suffering induced by the war on the soldiers he witnessed in combat, left an indelible mark on his visual imagination and psychic stability. As Hal Foster observes of Max Ernst's immediate post-war Dada work, fragmented bodies served as signs for 'a bashed ego' hovering between 'evocations of the narcissistic damage incurred during the war' and 'cautions against the reactionary obsession with the body armor' of fascism that followed.[48] A similar pattern can be discerned in Hoerle's oeuvre from the same period. As Seiwert's review indicates, the *Krüppelmappe* makes manifest the psychological horrors of war and appeals directly for both memorialisation and practical help.

Mental ailments amongst soldiers of the First World War, sparked by their brutal experiences of trench warfare, were far-reaching but to the medical military they were initially unexpected and unrecognised. Nationalist discourse in Germany before 1914 held that warfare would be the best medicine to revitalize a nervous and sickly population, etiolated by the enervating effects of modern city life. According to army medical officer

Walter Fuchs, war was 'the only means by which we, as a nation, can be saved from the physical and psychological lethargy and emasculation which are relentlessly threatening.'[49] Prevailing critical opinion in the immediate pre-war era was founded on the assumption that war would be won, not by technology or armaments but by soldiers 'holding their nerve.' As Austrian neurologist Adolf Friedländer prematurely remarked in 1916:

> 'On all fronts, in the field just as at home, German victory sparkles. It is the victory of strong German nerves, German composure, German will and the discipline of German men. The proliferation of psychoses and neuroses feared by many has by no means occurred. And the war has brought no significant increase in nervous and mental illness.'[50]

As Paul Lerner has commented, when war-wounded patients started appearing on the wards of German hospitals with what we now understand as symptoms of shell shock, including headaches, 'shaking, stuttering, tremors, tics, muteness, deafness and paralysis' the medical establishment initially completely failed to register the cause or treat it appropriately.[51] Yet by the end of 1918 war neuroses afflicted as many as 200,000 German troops. It was no longer an issue that German mental medicine could ignore. However, the ways in which the establishment chose to address it ultimately put the economic needs of the state above those of the individual veteran. As Lerner argues, 'doctors had two diagnostic choices for trauma cases: they could diagnose traumatic neurosis, guaranteeing their patients indefinite pension payments, or they could diagnose hysteria, which, attributing the symptoms to psychological reactions in a pre-morbid personality, ruled out a pension and mandated a return to work.'[52] The medical category of 'traumatic neurosis' had been recognised in 1889 by the Imperial Insurance Office as a condition that could be compensated but which was accompanied by the problem of so-called 'pension neurosis' - industrial accident victims seeking compensation for mental trauma on grounds that were difficult for insurance bureaucrats to prove or disprove. German opponents of 'traumatic neurosis' during the First World War based their resistance on the strongly held view that it was too expensive and would lead to a

'financially draining epidemic.'[53] By the 1920s, accusations of 'malingering' and 'pension neurosis' were frequently levelled at evidently shell-shocked veterans unable to hold down employment but who bore no visible external signs of war damage. And to make matters worse, in 1926 the 1889 Imperial Law in favour of victim compensation for 'traumatic neurosis' was overturned.[54] In Hoerle's *Krüppelmappe*, the viewer is left with the painful acknowledgement that whatever the German legislature concerning financial support for its war disabled was, no amount of practical aid would ever compensate for the fundamental psychic trauma endured by the survivors. Each image operates as much as a sign of lack and absence as it does of presence. The *Krüppelmappe* haunts Hoerle's subsequent oeuvre in different media and remains one of his most powerful political statements. As Kriebel suggests, the work anticipates both the Dadaists' and the Surrealists 'pre-occupation with the unconscious in all its phantasmal, disjunctive, enigmatic and oddly associative forms.' [55] In these early 'Stupid/Dada' years Hoerle, together with Max Ernst and Angelika Fick-Hoerle, excelled at creating phantasms of bodily horror as symptoms of the traumatic aftermath of war.

In *Fruits in the Tree of the Ebert Republic* of 1921, [Fig. 12] the political intent of *Krüppelmappe* is foregrounded whilst also retaining the nightmarish aspects of Hoerle's particular post-war vision. The image reprises Jacques Callot's 'The Hanging' from the 1633 etching suite, *The Miseries and Misfortunes of War* but inverts its message. [Fig.13] Callot's engraving, also shown in Luise Straus's exhibition, is one of a series of eighteen prints in the cycle. The work points a moral finger at a group of soldiers-turned-war criminals who are being publicly hanged as penalty for pillaging from local civilians in Lorraine, under the command of mercenary leader Count Mansfield a few years before Callot's memorialisation of the event. The words etched beneath Callot's harrowing depiction leave the viewer in no doubt as to the moral position enacted by the scene:

> 'Finally, these infamous and abandoned thieves, hanging from this tree like wretched fruit, show that crime (horrible and black species) is itself the instrument of

shame and vengeance, and that it is the fate of corrupt men to experience the justice of heaven sooner or later.'

Callot's 'Hanging' explores the moral and ethical dimensions of death as sanctioned punishment during war, an environment already plagued with the unnecessary loss of life. The 'fruits' of Hoerle's otherwise barren Republican tree are dangling prosthetic limbs and fractured skulls with anguished faces, many with bullet or stab wounds to the cranium. Whilst Callot's engraving serves as a moral and ethical arbiter of the boundaries of social behaviour, Hoerle's 'wretched fruits' are a satire against the bankruptcy of state rule during peacetime founded on the wreckage of a pointless war. Although some branches of the tree unfurl upwards, many are weighed down by their macabre load; the sinuous lines evident in the *Krüppelmappe* have not yet given way to the more rigid pictorial constructions of his subsequent oeuvre.

Hoerle's powerful graphic testimony to the disjunctive inner life of the defeated, disabled veteran in *Krüppelmappe* deployed the soldier's broken body as political sign. It signified as riposte to the right-wing factions of the Weimar constitution, implicitly satirised in *Fruits in the Tree of the Ebert Republic* and their increasingly dominant tendency to valorise a heroic war. This tendency was perhaps at its most virulent in Ernst Jünger's popular right-wing novel *Storm of Steel* (published in the same year as Hoerle's *Krüppelmappe* in 1920), a memoir of Jünger's wartime experiences as a soldier on the western front. Weimar audiences, demoralised by narratives of their nation's defeat could instead revel in Jünger's glorification of war and feel vindicated by the notions of noble sacrifice propounded therein. In visual terms, heroic imagery centred on the body of the ideal male warrior became a primary index of German patriotism during the Weimar era. Veterans who articulated the negative experiences of the war were increasingly 'branded as unpatriotic and cowardly.'[56] Such hostility towards them was further exacerbated by the widespread nationalist, conservative myth that the German army had not been defeated in the field but had been betrayed, 'stabbed in the back' by socialist revolutionaries at home.[57] As post-war

Germany was embracing the jazz age, their wounded, maimed and disabled veterans were being discarded as an embarrassing legacy of a failed conflict that no-one cared to be reminded of.

A Prosthetic Economy

Hoerle's exploration of the traumatic post-war experiences of the horrors of the battlefield in the *Krüppelmappe* remained a significant theme in his increasingly socially informed artwork in inter-war Germany but the ways in which he represented it changed significantly over the course of the Republic. By 1930, the psychic realities of mental anguish made explicit in the *Krüppelmappe* were supplanted in Hoerle's oeuvre by the material realities of the fragmented soldier's body, dependent on prosthetic limbs and memorialised in two striking paintings, *Monument to the Unknown Prostheses* [Fig. 14] and *Three Invalids* (*Machine Men*) [Fig. 15]. The stylistic shift between the 1920 portfolio and the 1930s paintings are palpable. In the intervening decade, the prosthetic body became a visual paradigm for the era's fascination with human and machine, perhaps represented at its most futuristic in Fritz Lang's epic science fiction film *Metropolis* (1926). Hoerle remained unique in his depiction of the prosthetic body as both a site of empathy and a symptom of the worker's alienation within the mechanized environment of industrial technological labour. If the *Cripple Portfolio* was a passionate moral protest against the inhumanity of war, *Monument to the Unknown Prostheses* and *Three Invalids* (*Machine Men*) were bitter acknowledgements of the sensory losses engendered by the post-war reconstruction of Weimar Germany. Their machine-aesthetic became a dominant visual trope of the era. Both were produced in 1930 at the height of the Great Depression, just after the Wall Street Crash in 1929 and on the eve of the complete disintegration of the Republic in the face of Nazism. The paintings are unusual in that they remain amongst the very few stark later reminders of the waning Weimar Republic's post-war dehumanisation of care for the disabled, in favour of increased industrial productivity in the new machine age. At the beginning of the decade, Dadaists had collectively recognised and understood the political imperatives driving the Republic's post-

war rehabilitation programmes. In November 1920 Raoul Hausmann published a satirical essay in *Die Aktion,* presciently entitled 'A Prosthetic Economy, (thoughts of a Kapp-officer)' which unambiguously yokes these imperatives together. The title of the piece references the failed Kapp-Lüttwiz Putsch, a coup in Berlin in March 1920 named after its leaders, which aimed to undo the gains of the German worker-revolutions of 1918-19 and overthrow the Republic in order to establish a right-wing autocracy. It was also one of the causes of the Ruhr uprising in the same month, closer to home for Hoerle and his Cologne comrades. Although the coup failed it had significant political consequences. Both uprisings were quashed by military force with support from the right. The majority left wing SPD lost over a third of its seats in the subsequent June 1920 elections, leading to the fragile coalition that was perpetually undermined by the right, to eventual breaking point in 1933.[58]

The reactionary Kapp-Officer of Hausmann's sardonic essay celebrates the efficiency and even desirability of having a prosthetic limb. He suggests that a prosthesis is as 'necessary today for the common man, as a Weiß beer' and laments the ingratitude of the proletariat who are 'never happy, including the ones with prostheses.'[59] He blames the number of injuries on the battlefield on the fact that too many soldiers want an iron cross, implying that they deliberately get themselves injured for reward and for a prosthetic limb. Amongst the most biting passages of the Kapp officer's reflections are when he proceeds to give examples of how wonderful a 'Brandenburger' prosthetic arm ('Der Brandenburger Kunstarm') would be:

> 'It could fit everyone. All the things you can do with it. Pour boiling water on it without getting scalded. Can a healthy arm do that? The Brandenburger arm is the biggest miracle of technology and a great mercy. Even bullets pass through it painlessly. So those wearing prostheses should not only think of their duties but also their right…the better amongst them plan an array of practical tasks which result in a

> twenty-five-hour day - because a prosthesis never gets tired. Piece work at low wages stimulates the feeling of being alive…low food rations: a man with a prosthesis doesn't need a full diet since he as lost a healthy limb...'[60]

As an astute observer and with his characteristic black humour, Hausmann satirises the German state's push to 'recycle the disabled' through enhanced prosthetic functionality but with little regard for the somatic individual.[61] The concluding sentence drives home the political targets of Hausmann's polemic:

> 'We will then have only two types of soldier, those who are shot dead immediately and the second category which will be presented with a prosthesis. With these people we will create the rebuilding of Germany. Every reasonable person therefore demands a prosthetic economy instead of the dictatorship of councils.'[62]

Hausmann's essay was motivated primarily as a political attack on the militarisation of medicine and the concomitant post-war industrial-capitalist drive to rebuild the broken economy at whatever cost, a drive that had merely transferred itself from the battlefield to the home front. Outlandish as it may seem, stemming from the pen of committed Berlin Dadaist, Hausmann's words are uncomfortably closer to the facts than one might at first imagine. On 6 September 1918, two years before Hausmann's polemic and Dix's montaged *45% fit for work* (*War Cripples*), at the very tail-end of the conflict, the German Minister of War, General Hermann von Stein, issued a letter to all Generals, to the War Economic offices, the Navy, the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry for Trade, commanding the redeployment of all available bodies for the war effort:

> 'Due to the desperate circumstances, the exploitation of all manpower…is hereby ordered. Therefore, all war-disabled soldiers who are capable of even the slightest amount of useful work are being commandeered for duty. Even those who have been labelled as 'severely injured' that is, evaluated at a medical disability of 50% or more, are still capable of work. Moreover, every public and private workplace must be informed that severely injured workers are better than none at all…The war-disabled

must be told that he is not being healed out of pity, but rather because his labour is crucial for the collective good.'[63]

The military's instrumental approach to its disabled veterans had already begun in 1915 when the Reich Office of the Interior held a meeting to decide how best to cope with the increasing numbers of war disabled. It was decided then that the goal of returning disabled veterans to work would be the best solution to their realisation of the otherwise financially draining problem that was being daily made manifest on the battlefields of the Front.[64] As Heather Perry has shown, the war prompted orthopaedists in Germany, who had previously predominantly been involved with the peacetime care of disabled children and accident victims, to radically re-orient their field.[65]

In 1915 two leading orthopaedists, Fritz Lange and Konrad Biesalski separately published influential tracts directing their profession towards the care of the war disabled. Lange's field manual for army doctors, *War Orthopaedics* and Biesalski's *War Cripple Welfare* helped to establish the medicalisation of disability in Germany both during and after the conflict.[66] Lange's book was primarily borne of his direct experiences working in field hospitals in France and was largely aimed at army doctors. It outlined orthopaedic techniques that could be used to rehabilitate frontline soldiers (for example bandaging fractures, setting arm and leg splints, using physical therapy and fitting prostheses).[67] As such it was an indispensable aid in the increase in successful medical treatment of soldiers at the Front who might otherwise have died. Biesalski's ideas on the other hand were directed at the state, as well as towards disabled veterans already returned from the Front. His arguments were framed in terms of the longer-term role he believed that disabled veterans should aim for in post-war society, namely as 'taxpayers rather than charity recipients.'[68] He argued that 'the numerous war cripples should merge into the masses of the people as if nothing has happened to them.'[69] As Carol Poore has cogently argued, German discourses on disability both during the war and immediately after were extremely complex and often contradictory. Biesalski serves as a good example in that his energetic approach to disabled veterans' rehabilitation

for work was certainly double-edged. On the one hand he viewed veterans as having the right to reintegrate and of returning to gainful employment and yet he also 'characterised rehabilitation as a practice of forgetting the injuries of war,' acting as if nothing had happened.[70] As Poore observes, it was experts rather than veterans who set the terms of how disabled people should adjust to their experiences in post-war society:

> 'Rehabilitation could have a democratic thrust in terms of helping disabled people regain the possibility of living full lives, but it could also have an authoritarian, repressive effect by reintegrating soldiers into the military apparatus and workers into a rigidly controlled industrial system...'[71]

The various 1920 laws passed in Germany on so-called 'Cripples Welfare', 'Military Pensions' and the 'Law for the Employment of the Severely Disabled' all jostled with one another in a matrix of 'normalcy' constructed by the non-disabled as legislative tools for the social care of the individual *and* the economic rehabilitation of the nation. It was the competing motives of these two separate but interrelated goals that characterises the complexities of disability discourses within the Weimar era and the cultural responses to it. For the most part, as we have seen in examples by Dix, Grosz and Hausmann, the leftist avant-garde used images of grotesquely disabled veterans and robotic prosthesis-wearers as tropes for vitriolic critique, especially in the early Dada days of the nascent Republic. Whilst some of Hoerle's early imagery conformed with this general tendency, his work differed in its initial empathy for the traumatic disturbances experienced by the disabled veteran. He was also alone amongst the avant-garde for his continued return to the imagery of prosthetic bodies, both male and female, in his work throughout the 1920s. *Three Invalids* (*Machine Men*) and *Monument to the Unknown Prostheses* both of 1930, bookend Hoerle's earlier commentary on the Republic's disabled veterans in *Krüppelmappe*. They demonstrate how his approach to the disabled male body shifted in line with the stylistic tendencies of the intervening decade but also how his critical approach to the subject matter moved almost

entirely from the explicit empathy with the veteran as demonstrated in *Krüppelmappe* to much more rigid critique of the regime as his focus.

Machine Men

After their flirtation with Berlin Dada and the gradual dissolution of Gruppe Stupid, by 1922 members of both groups, whilst remaining friends and regularly part of the same exhibiting networks, were pursuing their own artistic paths. Seiwert and Hoerle began working more closely together as a result of their shared political ideals and were joined by fellow artist Gerd Arntz. Together they became leaders of a loosely formed group known as the Cologne Progressives. Like early Berlin Dada, the Progressives aligned themselves with a radical Marxist political agenda. However, unlike Dada, they have been marginalised from standard accounts of revolutionary art during the Weimar period, largely as a result of their ongoing commitment to, though palpable struggle with, the role of easel painting in an age of radical politics. They maintained a specific interest in the relationship between the surface facture of the work and what they referred to as 'the worker-viewer's' experience. For the Progressives, if the worker was the backbone of society, then art ought to be a manifestation of the organisation of work, since it was only through the visible revelation of the structure of society through work that the ruling classes could be dismantled. Thus, it made no difference what medium the structure of society should be revealed in to the 'worker-viewer' of their art.[72] During the twenties, (until they fell out and parted company in 1932), Hoerle and Seiwert developed a distinct, geometric style in dialogue with one another, in which the concept of the artist as constructor became central. Yet Hoerle also moved fluidly through a plethora of alternative styles as distinct from his collaborations with Seiwert, in an array of artworks that he produced alongside this constructivist phase. These works ranged from the realism of new objectivity portraits to the precisionism of mechanistic abstraction and the predominance of cylindrical bodies, in which men and women were rendered as mechanistic automata. The common theme amongst many of these works remained the role of the prosthesis in the construction of the new human in post-war society. At the turn of the

century prostheses had generally been designed primarily for cosmetic purposes, in order to hide the disfigurement, rather than to function in any operational way. After the First World War however, the drive to rehabilitate the veteran for work meant that German orthopaedists were forced to re-think the design of the artificial limb. They moved away entirely from replicating the appearance of human limbs that might restore the veterans pride in their own appearance, to mechanically engineered pieces of machinery. 'Work-arms' were developed, capable of functioning in industrial environments but with little regard to the outlandish appearance that they might bestow. Artificial legs, however, received less attention since they were not regarded as essential for the performance of mechanical labour. Form was sacrificed for function - in a complete antithesis to the rallying cries of architectural modernism. Engineers and orthopaedists worked together to map the most common types of grip that the hand might daily perform and it is exactly these precision-engineered grips that Hoerle forgrounds in *Monument to an Unknown Prostheses,* giving them their own picture space on the two front profile men-machines and carefully delineated by differently coloured square backgrounds. What Hoerle's monument also highlights, is the fact that it is only a functioning 'Arbeiterhand' (worker-hand) that is of use to the state, not the whole man. The figure in the middle of Hoerle's composition is shown with amputated legs and no prostheses, one eye, an amputated arm and a prosthetic wrist awaiting its functional attachment, without which the man is rendered completely useless. Productive labour was aligned with the hand, the rest of the body was not a concern. *Monument to an Unknown Prostheses* is the culmination of Hoerle's preoccupation with the theme of alienated labour. In a vein not dissimilar from Otto Dix's turn to the triptych format for some of his most trenchant works from the later 1920s onwards (*Metropolis* of 1927-28 and *War* of 1929-32 in particular), Hoerle's *Monument* serves as an ironic altarpiece depicting an unholy Trinity of dehumanized machine men. The tragedy of the unknown soldier and the dignity inherent in the British and French post-war monuments devoted to him, has been inverted in Hoerle's stark address to the notable absence of such a monument under the auspices of the Weimar Republic.[73] If *Monument to*

the Unknown Prostheses inverts the altarpiece format, then *Three Invalids* - also known by multiple alternative titles, *Workmen, Machine Men, The Returnees* and *Prosthesis Wearers* - also plays with art historical forms in its recall of both an altarpiece side panel filled with flanking saints or patrons and in its evocation of the *Three Graces*. The three automata set in an urban landscape, their eyes closed and facing forward in profile with their prosthetic arms thrust forward are shown as essentially redundant without their functioning hand grip attachments, which they wait to be attached so they can march to work. The human body takes on futuristic form in Hoerle's hybrid humans. The appeal for empathy from the viewer is now suppressed in favour of a techno-rational 'sachlich' presentation of the logical outcome of the Republic's drive to turn the disabled veteran into a unit of economic productivity.

Conclusions

Amongst all of the major Weimar artists, it was Hoerle in particular for whom the prosthesis held the most fascination. Yet as Carol Poore has observed, visual representations of the disabled by non-disabled artists like Hoerle only offer limited roles for post-war veterans as 'impoverished, pitiful or grotesque' in a bid to 'confront the public with the hollowness of nationalistic, militaristic ideals' rather than to offer positive images for the veterans to reflect upon.[74] One of the very few examples in Germany of positive visual images of disabled veterans is possibly Sella Hasse's linocut of a *One-armed War-blinded Man at a Machine* dating from 1932 [Fig.16]. Yet this is both a significantly late contribution to the visual culture of the topic within Weimar art and one that is executed in an anachronistically expressionist format and style. Hasse's rendition and her choice of medium arguably reduces the work's efficacy as a potentially positive image-model for the subjects it seeks to represent. Again, Poore astutely observes that the work of Weimar's visual artists in depicting the war-disabled 'focused solely on a few very selective aspects of disability' and that until the disability rights activism of the late twentieth century, disability 'functioned as such a strongly marked category that it has almost always obliterated other dimensions' of the

lives of the individuals concerned from view in the cultural sphere.[75] There are many extant testimonies of individuals living well with a range of disabilities during the Weimar era, as there are many who did not.[76] The fact that so many Weimar artists engaged in representations of the war-disabled spoke less to a particularly enlightened decision to give voice to an under-represented group, than it did to an obvious vehicle for their political invectives against the new Republic. And the fact that so many of them had dropped the topic as the main focus of their visual repertoire by the mid 1920s, with the exception of Hoerle and occasionally Dix, seemed to indicate that empathy with the veterans as subjects rather than objects of representation remained limited within the visual economy of 'normalcy.'

---

[1] George Grosz *A Small Yes and a Big No*, trans. Arnold J. Pomerans, London 1982, 79-80. First published as George Grosz *Ein kleines Ja und ein grosses Nein*, New York 1946.

[2] Grosz, like many of his fellow Germans, had been initially resigned to the prospect of war, volunteering to serve with the second Kaiser Franz Grenadier Guards First Company in Berlin as early as November 1914, in all likelihood to avoid conscription at a later date. Although he never served at the Front, having eventually been discharged from psychiatric hospital as 'unfit for service', Grosz spent his Weimar years in the bitterest opposition to those whom he held accountable: the military, especially the Generals, the politicians, the war profiteers, the industrialists and the bourgeoisie. For a summary of Grosz's military service see Natascha Bolle 'George Grosz'*1914 The Avant-Gardes at War*, Bonn 2014, 336.

[3] Deborah Cohen 'Will to Work: Disabled Veterans in Britain and Germany after the First World War' in Gerber, David (ed.) *Disabled Veterans in History*, Michigan 2000, 295. It should be noted that exact statistics on the number of soldiers killed and those permanently disabled vary from source to source. The statistics provided in Cohen refer to the war in total on all sides, whereas Heather Perry provides statistics specifically for the German army. She states that 'although statistics vary, most historians agree that some 2037000 men were killed in battle while another 5687000 were wounded. The number of wounded is somewhat hard to determine as some soldiers were wounded, healed and…wounded again'. Heather R. Perry *Recycling the Disabled: Army, Medicine and Modernity in WWI Germany*, Manchester 2014, 2.

[4] Carol Poore *Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture*, Michigan, 2007, 19.

[5] Lennard J. Davis 'Introduction: Normality, Power and Culture' in *The Disability Studies Reader*, London, 2013, 1.

[6] Karoline Hille has categorised the four works as the 'prosthesis wearers series' in her essay '…"über den Grenzen, mitten in Nüchternheit": Prosthesenkörper, Maschinenherzen, Automatenhirne,' in Pia Müller-Tamm and Katharina Sykora (eds.) *Puppen Körper Automaten: Phantasmen der Moderne*, Cologne 1999, 145. The Austrian art historian and curator Wieland Schmied (1929-2014) was instrumental in ensuring that the legacies of Neue Sachlichkeit in Germany were not forgotten in the post-war era. In 1969 he published the large-scale catalogue *Neue Sachlichkeit und Magischer Realismus in Deutschland 1918-1933* which established him as the leading authority on the field for several decades. More recent scholarship has begun to question some of the categorisations established by Schmied. See for example Marsha Meskimmon *We Weren't Modern Enough: Women Artists and the Limits of German Modernism*, London 1999 and more recently Stephanie Barron and Sabine Eckmann (eds.) *New Objectivity: Modern german Art in the Weimar Republic 1919-1933*, Los Angeles 2015.

[7] See for example Mia Finemann 'Ecce Homo Prostheticus' *New German Critique*, No.76 Special Issue on Weimar Visual Culture (Winter, 1999), 93-96; Hanne Bergius "*Dada Triumphs!" Dada Berlin, 1917-1923, Artistry of Polarities*, trans. Brigitte Pichon, Michigan 2003, 254; Poore *Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture*, 2007, 29-32 and Matthew Biro *The Dada Cyborg: Visions of the New Human in Weimar Berlin*, Minnesota, 2009, 160-166 amongst others.

[8] Stephen Kinzer 'Berlin unveils a rescued Otto Dix of 1920' *New York Times* September 14 1995, C00013. Available: https://www.nytimes.com/1995/09/14/arts/berlin-unveils-a-rescued-otto-dix-of-1920.html

[9] Finemann 'Ecce Homo Prostheticus' 1999, 93.

[10] Young-Sun Hong *Welfare, Modernity and the Weimar State*, New Jersey 1999, 93.

[11] Paul Lerner *Hysterical men: War, neurosis and German mental medicine, 1914-1921* PhD dissertation, Columbia 1996, 393.

[12] Heather Perry *Recycling the disabled: Army, medicine and modernity in WW1 Germany*, Manchester 2014, 182.

[13] Deborah Cohen *The War Come Home: Disabled Veterans in Britain and Germany 1914-1939*, California 2001, 151.

[14] Christopher Jackson 'Infirmative Action: The Law of the Severely Disabled in Germany' *Central European History*, vol.26, no.4, Cambridge 1993, 417-18.

[15] The sub-title of this work was noted by Conrad Felixmuller and cited in Matthias Eberle *World War I and the Weimar Artists: Dix, Grosz, Beckmann, Schlemmer*, New Haven 1984, 44. The idea that Dix's figures are

'military cyborgs' is mooted by Matthew Biro in *The Dada Cyborg: Visions of the New Human in Weimar Berlin*, Minnesota 2009, 163. The second soldier on the left is depicted with a trembling aura, clearly an allusion to his shell shock and known colloquially in Weimar Germany as 'shiverers' or 'shakers'.

[16] Deborah Cohen *The War Come Home: Disabled Veterans in Britain and Germany 1914-1939*, Berkeley 2001, 154.

[17] Cohen in Gerber (ed.) 2000, 296-297.

[18] For more on the establishment of the Weimar Republic in the wake of the communist revolutions across Germany in 1918-1919 and their bloody suppression by the far right who remained unpunished for the murder of left-wing political activists including Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, see Eric Weitz 'A Troubled Beginning' in *Weimar Germany: Promise and Tragedy*, New Jersey 2007, 7-40.

[19] Finemann 'Ecce Homo Prostheticus' 1999, 85-114.

[20] My own published work on Weimar Germany to date has largely focused on representations of gender and sexuality through the particular lens of the 'new woman' and female artists but with very little consideration of a more holistic view of the diversity of 'Weimar's 'Others' or of competing constructions of masculinity also prevalent in the culture of the era. Dorothy Rowe *Representing Berlin: Sexuality and the City in Imperial and Weimar Germany*, Surrey 2003; Dorothy C. Rowe *After Dada: Martha Hegemann and the Cologne Avant-Garde*, Manchester 2013 and numerous essays on Weimar Germany's troubled trope of the 'new woman.'

[21] Rosemarie Garland Thomson *Extraordinary Bodies: Figuring Physical Disability in American Culture and Literature*, New York 2017.

[22] The concept of a 'prosthetic economy' is borrowed from Berlin Dadaist Raoul Hausmann's satirical essay *Prothesenwirtschaft* published in Franz Pfemmert (ed.) *Die Aktion*, Berlin, November 1920, 669-70.

[23] For more on Hegemann and Räderscheidt see Dorothy Rowe *After Dada: Marta Hegemann and the Cologne Avant Garde*, Manchester 2013. For more on Willy Fick, see Wulf Herzogenrth and Dirk Teuber with Angie Littlefield (eds.) *Willy Fick: Ein Kölner Maler der zwanziger Jahre wiederentdeckt*, Cologne 1986 and for more on Angelika Hoerle see Angie Littlefield (ed.) *Angelika Hoerle: Comet of Cologne Dada*, Cologne and Toronto 2008.

[24] The Gereons Club was founded by the artists Emmy Worringer (1878-1961) Olga Oppenheimer (1886-1941), and Franz M. Jansen (1885-1958). It became a significant showcase for modern art in Cologne and was named after the street in which Max Oppenheimer built his offices. His daughter Olga, co-founder of the club, occupied the fifth floor with her studio, painting and drawing school. The 1912 Klee exhibition was shown in the Club's new premises in Hansahaus, 16 Friesenplatz. See Uta Gerlach-Laxner 'Paul Klee im Gereonsklub und die

rheinische Kunstszene um den jungen Max Ernst' in Sommer, Achim (ed.) *In Augenhöhe: Paul Klee Frühe Werke im Blick auf Max Ernst*, Brühl 2006, 19-71

[25]Ernst also met Paul Klee during this period. For more on the visual exchanges between Ernst and Klee in Cologne during this period and immediately after the First World War, see Uta Gerlach-Laxner 'Paul Klee im Gereonsklub und die rheinische Kunstszene um den jungen Max Ernst' and Jürgen Pech `Der Besuch von Max Ernst bei Paul Klee im Herbst 1919 – Kreuzung zweier Karrieren' in Sommer, Achim (ed.) *Im Augenhöhe: Paul Klee Frühe Werke im Blick auf Max Ernst* 2006, 19-124.

[26] Horst Richter *Heinrich Hoerle und sein Kreis,* Frechen 1971, n.p.

[27] I use the anachronistic term 'war cripple' in this essay only in so far as it is a historically specific one for the period as a direct translation of the German 'Kriegskrüppel'.

[28] For more on the Hoerles and their role within the various factions of the avant-garde in Cologne in the immediate post-war era, see Dorothy Rowe *After Dada: Marta Hegemann and the Cologne Avant-Garde*, Manchester 2013.

[29] Sabine Kriebel 'Cologne' in Leah Dickerman (ed.) *Dada*, Washington 2006, 214-23 and Charlotte Stokes and Stephen Foster (eds.) *Crisis and the Arts: The History of Dada,* vol.3 *Dada Cologne Hanover*, New York 1997.

[30] Ernst, Arp and Baargeld used the terms *Weststupidien* and *Oststupidien* in *Der Ventilator* in satirical reference to Germany as a land of dimwits, as well as naming themselves the three *Weststupidien* or *W/3*. For further details see Littlefield, Angie *The Dada Period in Cologne*, Toronto 2008, 13 and Sabine T Kriebel 'Cologne' in Dickerman, Leah (ed.) *Dada: Zurich, Berlin, Hannover, Cologne, New York, Paris*, Washington 2005.

[31] Lynette Roth *Painting as Weapon: Progressive Cologne 1920-33* exh. cat. Museum Ludwig Köln, Verlag der Buchhandlung Walther König, Köln 2008, 40. For more on the relationship between revolutionary politics, Dada and the Weimar avant garde, see also Deborah Lewer 'Revolution and the Weimar Avant-Garde: Contesting the Politics of Art 1919-1924' in John A. Williams (ed.) *Weimar Culture Revisited*, New York 2011, 1-22.

[32]Although we don't know the exact date, Lynette Roth suggests that this letter was `likely written in autumn 1919 when [Seiwert] left *Gruppe D*.' Roth also includes a partial translation of the letter. See *Painting as Weapon: Progressive Cologne 1920-33* exh. cat. Museum Ludwig Köln, Verlag der Buchhandlung Walther König, Köln 2008, 48. The translation cited here is indebted to Roth but is also partially my own with the assistance of Christine Bissell. The full text of the letter is published in Bohnen, Uli and Backes, Dirk (eds.) *Franz W. Seiwert Schriften,* Karin Kramer Verlag, Berlin 1978, p. 79 Letter III/I.

[33] See Robin Riesenfeld (ed.) *The German Print Portfolio, 1890-1930: Serials for a Private Sphere*, Chicago 1992

[34] A key link between the different centres of avant-garde activity in Germany after the war was Franz Pfemert who was editor of the radical left journal *Die Aktion*. See Paul Raabe (ed.) *Die Aktion: Franz Pfemert*, Stuttgart 1961.

[35] In typically Dadaist manner, the names of both Schloemilch Verlag and Stupid Verlag evoke associations with nonsense in a deliberately subversive vein. The adoption and regular use of English words as proper nouns was a regular practice amongst the group as an ironic resistance to the occupation of the Rheinland by British forces and a register of dissatisfaction with the consequent restriction of their movements and activities. Max and Luise Ernst's son was born Hans-Ulrich but became 'Jimmy' as a nickname in reference to the English 'Jimmies' – slang for the occupying soldiers. Schlömilch however may have very different subversive intent. It is well known that Ernst, together with Man Ray, Naum Gabo and numerous avant-garde modernists, had a keen interest in mathematics. In his semi-autobiographical text *Beyond Painting* (Wittenborn Schulz, New York, 1948) Ernst proffers a definition of collage as 'chance, in the sense that Hume defined it: "the equivalent of the ignorance in which we find ourselves in relation to the real causes of events", a definition increasingly confirmed by the development of the mathematics of probability, and by the importance of the discipline in modern science and practical life' (p.16). The word Schlömilch may well refer to the German statistician Oskar Schlömilch (1823-1901) who gave his name to the *Schlömilch transformation* which according to Rose Baker has 'long been used by mathematicians for integral evaluation allowing probability mass to be redistributed' and 'thus transforming old distributions to new ones' (Rose Baker 'Probalistic Applications of the Schlömilch Transformation' in *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, vol.37, issue 14, January 2008, (Routledge, London and New York), 2162-2176. The concept of transformation or metamorphosis from old values into new operates as a perfect metaphor for the Dadaist activities of the Schlömilch Verlag. For references to the Hoerle's apartment as the *Dadaistenheim* see 'Im Kölner Dadaistenheim' *Rheinische Zeitung* 19.2.20 reprinted in Herzogenrath, Wulf (ed.) *Max Ernst in Köln: Die Rheinische Kunstszene bis 1922*, Rheinland-Verlag, 1980, p.34

[36] Japan paper is a good quality paper which is lightly translucent and extremely resistant. It is generally preferred for fine impressions.

[37] See Backes, Dirk (ed.) *Heinrich Hoerle: Leben und Werk 1895-1936*, Köln 1981, 101-104 and 210.

[38] Sabine Kriebel 'Cologne' in Leah Dickermann (ed.) *Dada* Washington 2006, 228.

[39] Sabine Kriebel 'Cologne' in Leah Dickermann (ed.) *Dada* Washington 2006, 228.

[40] The choice of an allusion to the topos of *Adam and Eve* stylistically indebted to Northern Renaissance renditions by artists such as Cranach and Dürer, may well also have inspired by Max Ernst's notorious inclusion of Dürer's print into one of his own sculptures at the Cologne *Dada-Vorfrühling* (Dada Early Spring) exhibition,

a move which caused the exhibition to be closed on the grounds of obscenity, a charge later dropped when it was established that the full frontal nudity was actually a Dürer print. See Charlotte Stokes 'Rage and Libertion: Cologne Dada' in Stokes and Foster (eds.) *Dada, Cologne, Hanover*, New York 1997, 54.

[41] Sabine Kriebel 'Cologne' in Leah Dickermann (ed.) *Dada* Washington 2006, 228.

[42] Louise Straus-Ernst *The First Wife's Tale: A Memoir* (written in 1941-42 and translated by Marylin Richter and Mariette Schmitz-Esser) New York, 2004, 25.

[43] Luise Straus *Museum Wallraf-Richartz: Alte Kriegsdarstellungen (Graphik des 15. bis 18. Jahrhunderts*), Cologne 1917, 12.

[44] 'Mancher mag sich abgetoßen fühlen, mancher die Absicht Hoerles als unkünstlerisch empfinden, weil sie bedrückt und nicht befreit; es zeugt aber von tiefem Mitleiden, wir er den Armlosen von seinem Arm träumen, dem Verkrüppelten aus Busch und Baum die genommenen Glieder gleichsam entgegenblühen läßt.'*Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger* January 1920, cited in Backes, Dirk (ed.) *Heinrich Hoerle: Leben und Werk 1895-1936* Rheinland-Verlag, Köln 1981,104

[45] "Ein schauriger, grotesker, erschütternder Totentanz. Denn das sind ja nur noch Tote, diese Menschen, die der Krieg zerschossen und zerfetzt hat, die ein Leben nur noch im Traum und in der wirren Phantasie des Fiebers leben. Hohn auf die Menschheit, die in grauenvollem Wahn der Selbstvernichtung sich preisgab, sprüht aus diesen Blättern, Haß auf den organisierten Mord, den die „Kultur" des 20. Jahrhunderts vollführte, eine Klage, die versteinte Herzen rühren sollte, und zugleich eine Liebe zu allem, was Mensch und darum Schicksalhafte Verknüpfung ist. Hoerle treibt die Idee bis zur Tendenz vor, Tendenz in dem Sinne, daß er die eine Empfindung, die in ihm lebt und die Aufschrei der Seele ist, in ihrer ganzen Glut und aufreizenden Wucht expressive macht." *Der Kölner Tageblatt* January 1920, cited in Backes, Dirk (ed.) *Heinrich Hoerle: Leben und Werk 1895-1936* Rheinland-Verlag, Köln 1981, p.104

[46] Lucian Hölscher '1914: The Rupture in History' in Uwe Schneede (ed.) *1914: Avant-Gardes at War*, Bonn 2014, 15.

[47] F.W. Seiwert 'Krupp-Krüppel' in *Sozialistische Republik*, Organ der KPD, Bezirk Mittelrhein, 30.1.1920 reprinted in Bohnen and Backes (eds.) *Franz Seiwert: Schriften*, Berlin 1978, 14.

[48] Hal Foster 'A Bashed Ego' in *Prosthetic Gods*, Massachusetts 2004, 151.

[49] Cited in Wolfgang Mommsen, 'The Topos of Inevitable War in Germany in the Decade before 1914', in Volker Berghahn and Martin Kitchen (eds.), *Germany in the Age of Total War* London, 1981, 26.

[50] Adolf Albrecht Friedländer *Medizin und Krieg*, Wiesbaden 1916, n.p.

[51] Paul Lerner *Hysterical Men: War, Psychiatry and the Politics of Trauma in Germany, 1890-1930*, Ithaca 2003, 61.

[52] Paul Lerner *Hysterical Men: War, Psychiatry and the Politics of Trauma in Germany, 1890-1930*, Ithaca 2003, 105.

[53] Fischer-Homburger, *Die traumatische Neurose*: *Vom somatischen zum sozialem Leiden*, Bern 1975, 58.

[54] Paul Lerner *Hysterical Men: War, Psychiatry and the Politics of Trauma in Germany, 1890-1930*, Ithaca 2003, 103.

[55] Sabine T Kriebel 'Cologne' in Dickerman, Leah (ed.) *Dada*, Washington 2006, 228

[56] Ann Murray 'A War of Images: Otto Dix and the Myth of the War Experience' in *Aigne* 5, Dublin 2014, 61.

[57] See Anne Marno 'The Etching Series *Der Krieg*' in Susanne Meyer-Büser (ed.) *Otto Dix - der böse Blick* Düsseldorf and Munich 2017, 184.

[58] Histories of the Weimar Republic abound but for a concise account of the political history of the era, see John Hiden *The Weimar Republic*, London 1996.

[59] Raoul Hausmann 'Prothesenwirtschaft (Gedank eines Kapp-Offiziers)' *Die Aktion* Berlin, November 1920, 669.

[60] Raoul Hausmann 'Prothesenwirtschaft (Gedank eines Kapp-Offiziers)' *Die Aktion* Berlin, November 1920, 670.

[61] See Heather Perry *Recycling the Disabled: Army, Medicine and modernity in WW1 Germany*, Manchester 2014.

[62] Raoul Hausmann 'Prothesenwirtschaft (Gedank eines Kapp-Offiziers)' *Die Aktion* Berlin, November 1920, 670.

[63] Letter from General Hermann von Stein, German War Ministry dated 6 September 1918, Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde R1501/113089 cited in Perry *Recycling the Disabled* 2014, 1.

[64] Christopher Jackson 'Infirmative Action' *Central European History*, 1993, 420.

[65] Heather Perry *Recycling the Disabled: Army, Medicine and modernity in WW1 Germany*, Manchester 2014.

[66] Fritz Lange and J. Trumpp *Kriegs-Orthopädie*, Munich 1915 and Konrad Biesalski *Kriegskrüppelfürsorge. Ein Aufklärungswort zum Troste und zur Mahnung*, Leipzig 1915.

[67] Heather Perry *Recycling the Disabled: Army, Medicine and modernity in WW1 Germany*, Manchester 2014, 31.

[68] Konrad Biesalski *Kriegskrüppelfürsorge: Ein Aufklärungswort zum Troste und zur Mahnung*, Leipzig 1915, 34.

[69] Konrad Biesalski *Kriegskrüppelfürsorge*, 1915, 34.

[70] Poore *Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture* 2007, 9.

[71] Poore *Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture* 2007, 9.

[72] For more on this see Lynette Roth, *Painting as Weapon: Progressive Cologne 1920–1933*, Cologne 2008, 24–34.

[73] Only in 1931 was the architect Heinrich Tessanow (1876-1950) commissioned by the Prussian state government to convert the Neue Wache in Unter Den Linden into what was known as the 'Memorial for the Fallen of the War.' See Marco de Michelis *Heinrich Tessenow*, Milan 1991.

[74] Poore *Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture* 2007, 5-6.

[75] Poore *Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture* 2007, 37.

[76] Eye-witness accounts and testimonials abound, many of which are cited in Cohen *The War Come Home* 2001; Poore *Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture* 2007 and Bernd Ulrich and Benjamin Ziemann *German Soldiers in the Great War: Letters and Eyewitness Accounts*, Barnsley, 2010.